

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-11, 13, 15, 16, 18-20, and 22-29 are currently pending
- Claims 1, 13, 15, 18, 19, and 22-28 are amended herein

Cited Documents

[0003] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Yellepeddy: Yellepeddy, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0145003
- Thatcher: Thatcher et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,061,743

Yellepeddy Fails to Anticipate Claims 1-2, 8, 13, 19-20, 22, and 26

[0004] Claims 1-2, 8, 13, 19-20, 22, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Yellepeddy. In response, Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the Examiner's rejections.

Independent Claim 1

[0005] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 1 is moot. Specifically, Yellepeddy does not disclose the claimed:

receiving, by a computing device, an indication of a change to data comprising a reference in a first external object in a first namespace, wherein the reference refers to a second external object in the first namespace, the first external object and the second external object each having an associated central representation in a second namespace;

evaluating, by the computing device, an association between the central representation of the second object and the second object in the first namespace to identify a third external object in a third namespace, the third external object and the second external object sharing a unique identifier; and

propagating, by the computing device, the changed data to the third namespace to update the third external object and to update a fourth external object of the third namespace which includes a reference to the third external object,

wherein the references in the first and fourth external objects are the names of the first and fourth external objects in their respective namespaces and differ based on those namespaces.

[0006] Rather, Yellepeddy simply describes a metadirectory that joins tables from multiple databases for the same object (see paragraph 49). The metadirectory includes some, but not all, of the fields from each database (see paragraph 60). When a change is made to an entry in one of the databases, that change is communicated to a joiner of the metadirectory to determine whether the change is valid (paragraph 54). If valid, the change is propagated to other directories within the metadirectory.

[0007] Thus, at best Yellepeddy describes the propagating of a change from one directory to another. Nothing in Yellepeddy, however, discloses that the change is a change to a name of an object or that the names “differ based on those namespaces”.

[0008] In fact, Yellepeddy only describes outright replication. Thus, any change that is propagated to another directory in Yellepeddy is to make the identical change to that other directory. If the change to the object in the other directory is to make the other object identical to the changed object, then those objects do not “differ based on” their respective directories. By enabling updating of a name that differs based on its namespaces, the claimed subject matter recognizes that different namespaces may have different naming conventions or requirements and that simple replication, as described in paragraph 54 of Yellepeddy, will not suffice for updating names of an object common to the different namespaces.

[0009] Consequently, Yellepeddy does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Yellepeddy does not anticipate this claim, and respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 13, 22, and 26

[0010] These claims include recitations similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, they are patentable over Yellepeddy.

Dependent Claims 2, 8, 19, and 20

[0011] Claims 2, 8, 19, and 20 ultimately depend from independent claims 1 and 13. As discussed above, claims 1 and 13 are not anticipated by the cited documents, and is therefore patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2, 8, 19, and 20 are also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from a patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features that each recites.

Claims 3-7, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, 23-25, and 27-29 Are Non-Obvious Over

Yellepeddy and further in view of Thatcher

[0012] Claims 3-7, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, 23-25, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Yellepeddy and further in view of Thatcher. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0013] Thatcher does not cure the above discussed deficiencies of Yellepeddy and is not cited as doing so. Thus, claims 1, 13, 22, and 26 would remain patentable even if Thatcher were combined with Yellepeddy to reject those claims.

[0014] Claims 3-7, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, 23-25, and 27-29 depend from claims 1, 13, 22, and 26, respectively, incorporating their recitations. Thus, claims 3-7, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, 23-25, and 27-29 are patentable over Yellepeddy and Thatcher for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 13, 22, and 26 are.

Conclusion

[0015] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck/
Robert C. Peck(robpc@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)
Registration No. 56826

Dated: July 27, 2009

Reviewer/Supervisor: Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162)
Registration No. 53725